



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,580	09/23/2003	Aidan T. Hughes	60001.0026USD1/MS111814.3	2394
27488 7590 07/05/2007 MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT) P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			EXAMINER BADII, BEHRANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3694	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/668,580	Applicant(s) HUGHES ET AL.	
	Examiner Behrang Badii	Art Unit 3694	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claims 8-18 have been examined. P = paragraph, e.g. p1 = paragraph 1.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 8-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear as to how a single ID can be used for a single computer and yet comprises a plurality a plurality of hardware device identifier portions. Does the single computer ID change if any or all of the individual hardware devices change? How does that applicant carry this out?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karp, USP 4,866,769, and further in view of Leyda, U.S. patent 5,867,730.

As per claim 8, Karp discloses a single computer system ID for identifying a computer system, wherein the single computer-system ID is stored on the computer system and is generated during the installation of a software product on the computer system, wherein the single computer system ID represents the computer system plurality of components and wherein the single computer system ID comprises a variable number of bits corresponding to the ability to differentiate multiple computer systems based on a particular component having a unique identifier, wherein the particular component is one of the plurality of components (abstract). Karp does not disclose the computer system comprising a plurality of components, each component having a unique identifier wherein the single computer system ID comprises a plurality of hardware device identifier portions each hardware device identifier portion associated with a single component of the computer system. Leyda discloses the computer system comprising a plurality of components, each component having a unique identifier wherein the single computer system ID comprises a plurality of hardware device identifier portions each hardware device identifier portion associated with a single component of the computer system (abstract; col.6, 35-54). It would have been obvious to modify Karp to include the computer system comprising a plurality of components, each component having a unique identifier wherein the single computer system ID comprises a plurality of hardware device identifier portions each hardware device identifier portion associated with a single component of the computer system such as that taught by Leyda in order to have a system and method to aid in the installation

and/or reinstallation of computer software in a simplified and automated manner (Leyda, col.1, 48-53).

Claim 9-18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karp, USP 4,866,769, and Leyda, U.S. patent 5,867,730 as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Subler, USP 5,646,992 Kedeem, U.S. patent 6,845,428; Bodo, U.S. patent 6,480,925; Bondy et al., U.S. patent, 5,491,813; Dapper et al., U.S. patent application publication 2002/0106060 and Benson, IV et al., U.S. patent 6,081,752.

As per claim 9, Karp discloses a single computer system ID for identifying a computer system as disclosed above. Karp does not disclose the plurality of hardware device identifier portions identifying a plurality of hardware devices comprises **at least two members** (the following rejection includes all, and not **at least two members**) of a group comprising: a CD-ROM device portion identifying a CD-ROM device of the computer system; a disk adapter portion identifying a disk adapter of the computer system; a disk device portion identifying a disk device of the computer system; a display adapter portion identifying a display adapter of the computer system; a first drive serial portion identifying a disk drive of the computer system; a MAC address portion identifying a MAC address of the computer system; a processor serial number portion identifying a processor serial number of the computer system; a processor type portion identifying a processor type of the computer system; a RAM size portion identifying a RAM size of the computer system; and a SCSI adapter portion identifying a SCSI adapter of the computer system.

Leyda discloses a CD-ROM device portion identifying a CD-ROM device of the computer system (abstract; col.6, 35-54).

Subler et al. discloses wherein the CD-ROM device portion, the disk adapter portion, the disk device portion, the display adapter portion, the first serial drive portion, the MAC address portion, the processor serial number portion, the processor type portion, the RAM size portion, and the SCSI adapter portion of the hardware ID are generated during the installation of the software product on the computer system (col.4, 55-64). Kedeem discloses a disk adapter portion identifying a disk adapter of the computer system (col.16, 61-67; col.17, 1-15). Bodo discloses a disk device portion identifying a disk device of the computer system (col.5, 25-35) and a first drive serial portion identifying a disk drive of the computer system (col.5, 25-35). Bondy et al. discloses a display adapter portion identifying a display adapter of the computer system (col.6, 7-17). Dapper et al. discloses a MAC address portion identifying a MAC address of the computer system (paragraph 609) and a processor serial number portion identifying a processor serial number of the computer system (paragraph 350). Benson, IV et al. discloses a processor type portion identifying a processor type of the computer system (col.7, 49-67; col.8, 1-33) and a RAM size portion identifying a RAM size of the computer system (col.50, 12-19 & col.65, 17-25). Leyda and Bodo disclose a SCSI adapter portion identifying a SCSI adapter of the computer system (Leyda: col.10, 46-67; col.11, 1-15) (Bodo: fig's 1-5). Leyda and/or Kedem and/or Bodo suggest a hardware ID comprising a predetermined number of bits representing the plurality of components and wherein the hardware ID comprised a variable number of bits

representing each portion of the hardware ID, the variable number of bits corresponding to the ability to differentiate multiple computer systems based on a particular component in the plurality of components (Leyda: table 2; Kedem: col.16, 61-67; col.17, 1-15; Bodo: col.4, 21-39; col.5, 25-35). It would have been obvious to modify Karp to include a disk adapter portion identifying a disk adapter of the computer system; a disk device portion identifying a disk device of the computer system; a display adapter portion identifying a display adapter of the computer system; a first drive serial portion identifying a disk drive of the computer system; a MAC address portion identifying a MAC address of the computer system; a processor serial number portion identifying a processor serial number of the computer system; a processor type portion identifying a processor type of the computer system; a RAM size portion identifying a RAM size of the computer system; and a SCSI adapter portion identifying a SCSI adapter of the computer system such as taught by the references above in order for each part of the hardware system to be accounted for when a software is installed on the system to minimize the illegal use of software and hardware components.

As per claim 10-16 & 18, Karp discloses a single computer system ID for identifying a computer system as disclosed above. Karp does not disclose wherein the CD-ROM device portion comprises a hashing of a CD-ROM device identification string (hashing of data), the disk adapter portion comprising a hashing of disk adapter peripheral component interface (PCI) vendor and device identifications (hashing of data), the disk device portion comprising a hashing of a disk device identification string (hashing of data), the display adapter portion comprising a hashing of video adapter PCI

vendor and device identifications (hashing of data), the first drive serial portion comprising a hashing of an operating system assigned serial number of a first partition (hashing of data), the MAC address portion comprising a hardware address of a network interface connecting the computer system to a shared network, the processor serial number portion comprises an identification of the manufacturer's serial number for the processor of the computer system. Dapper et al. discloses wherein the CD-ROM device portion comprises a hashing of a CD-ROM device identification string (hashing of data) (paragraph 379), the disk adapter portion comprising a hashing of disk adapter peripheral component interface (PCI) vendor and device identifications (hashing of data) (paragraph 379), the disk device portion comprising a hashing of a disk device identification string (hashing of data) (paragraph 379), the display adapter portion comprising a hashing of video adapter PCI vendor and device identifications (hashing of data) (paragraph 379), the first drive serial portion comprising a hashing of an operating system assigned serial number of a first partition (hashing of data) (paragraph 379), the MAC address portion comprising a hardware address of a network interface connecting the computer system to a shared network (paragraph 609), the processor serial number portion comprises an identification of the manufacturer's serial number for the processor of the computer system (paragraphs 609). It would have been obvious to modify Karp to include the hashing of data such as that taught by Dapper et al. in order to improve the time searched for the data when finding and retrieving the data from a database.

As per claim 17. Karp discloses a single computer system ID for identifying a computer system as disclosed above. Karp does not disclose wherein the RAM size

Art Unit: 3694

portion comprises the size of the RAM in the computer system in megabytes. Benson, IV et al. discloses wherein the RAM size portion comprises the size of the RAM in the computer system in megabytes (col. 38-44). It would have been obvious to modify Karp to include the RAM size portion comprising the size of the RAM in the computer system in megabytes in order to the RAM size to be used as one of several identifying parts of the systems when a software is to be installed.

As per claim 18, Leyda and Bodo further disclose wherein the SCSI adapter portion comprises an identification of the Small Computer Systems Interface (SCSI) adapter of the computer system (Leyda: col.10, 46-67; col.11, 1-15) (Bodo: fig's 1-5) as per the motivation given above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3694

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Behrang Badii whose telephone number is 571-272-6879. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to (571)273-8300

Hand delivered responses should be brought to


United States Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Art Unit: 3694

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 3600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3600**.

Behrang Badii
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3621

BB



BLA COLBERT
PRIMARY EXAMINER